

REMARKS

This application has been amended so as to place it in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action.

The Official Action objects to claim 1 for its recitation of "multiplexer" instead of "demultiplexer" in line 5 thereof. Please note that applicants have amended such claim to make the requested correction, and reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are therefore respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 1-3 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over OLIVER in view of BIRCH et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested for the following reasons:

The Official Action identifies the elements that the applied references are offered as teaching. As part of this identification, the Official Action includes a specific acknowledgement that OLIVER does not expressly disclose a host constituted by a decoder for the reception of digital television including a demodulator, a processor, a multiplexer and a component (ASIC) aiding the processor to recognize automatically each module.

Applicants agree to the existence of these differences relative to the OLIVER reference. Thus, OLIVER neither relates to the field of decoders for digital television, nor does it disclose a means for automatically recognizing several modules.

Moreover, there would be no point in including an automatic recognition means in the context of computer hardware, given that the user has no need of modules that are frequently inserted and removed relative to the host. However, the situation is totally different in the field of decoders for digital television.

The BIRCH et al. document relates to the field of digital television and has elemental components of a decoder for the reception of digital television signals and their processing. Given that, the BIRCH et al. document does not relate to the recognition of different modules nor to the switching of the input or output transfers at the level of the modules.

As a result, applicants consider that on the basis of the teachings of OLIVER and BIRCH et al., one of skill in the art would not have produced a device according to the invention, in particular because he would not have been able to produce, in the absence of the teachings of the present application, a means for automatic recognition of the modules.

To the extent to which the OLIVER document relates to a computer hardware architecture, it would not have been obvious to a person of skill in the art to use information contained in OLIVER in the field of decoders for television. But even if one skilled in the art would have succeeded in using these teachings and in applying them to a decoder of the type disclosed by BIRCH

et al., he would produce a decoder with the following characteristics:

- the presence of several modules;
- switching of the flows from the modules; and
- control of switching of the flow by action of the user or by a command of the computer system (processor).

This does not correspond to the object of the invention of the present application as claimed because no information as to recognition of the modules and use of this information for switching the flows would be produced by the offered combination of OLIVER and BIRCH et al.

One should bear in mind the interest in the means for automatic recognition of the modules. In particular, it is a matter of guesswork for the user who no longer has need for particular competence to determine into which reader it is necessary to insert each module. This also permits providing modules and standard connection means particularly without the presence of an error corrector to avoid any insertion of module in an inappropriate recess.

As a result, applicants consider that it is not evident to one skilled in the art to arrive at the object of the invention based only on the combined teachings of OLIVER and BIRCH et al. even if he were to combine these two documents.

As the combination of references fails to teach or suggest the full set of features recited in the present claims, applicants respectfully suggest that the present obviousness rejection cannot reasonably be maintained.

Entry of the above amendments is earnestly solicited. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



---

Eric Jensen, Reg. No. 37,855  
745 South 23<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

EJ/lk